

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 10, 2005, the Examiner noted that claims 1, 3, 10-12, 14, and 22-25 were pending, and objected to claims 1, 3, 10-12, 14, and 22-25. The Examiner's objections are traversed below.

In the Action the Examiner objected to the claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 12, 14, 22, 23, 24 and 25 for lack of clarity. We do not understand this objection.

The Action objects to claims 1, 3, 10 and 11 for lack of clarity with respect to the phrase "said indicated video moving picture image data which have been stored in said first digital storage unit". Prior (or antecedent) to the above claim phrase, in lines 4-7, claim 1 recites:

a first digital data storage unit storing said received broadcast video **moving picture image data** according to a FIFO sequence;
a second digital data storage unit storing **an indicated video moving picture image data in said stored received broadcast image data of said first storage unit**;

Based on this recitation, in claim 1 it appears that the first storage unit stores the data and the second storage unit stores the indication about the data. We do not understand how the phrase of concern is unclear in the context of what the prior part of the claim says. Claims 3, 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 1 is requested.

The Action objects to claims 12 and 14 for lack of clarity with respect to the phrase "said indicated video moving picture image data which have been stored in said first random-access storage unit". Prior (or antecedent) to the above claim phrase, in lines 2-7, claim 12 recites:

a first random-access digital data storage unit storing received broadcast video **moving picture image data** according to a FIFO sequence;
a second digital data storage unit storing **an indicated video moving picture image data in said stored received broadcast image data of said first random-access storage unit**;

Based on this recitation, in claim 12 it appears that the first storage unit stores the data and the second storage unit stores the indication about the data. We do not understand how the phrase of concern is unclear in the context of what the prior part of the claim says. Claims 14 depends from claim 12. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 12 is requested.

The Action objects to claims 22, 23, 24 and 25 essentially for the same reason concerning "indicated" moving picture data. In about lines 4/5-6/7 of these claims similar antecedent support and phraseology can be seen. We do not understand how the phrases of

concern are unclear in the context of what the prior part of the claims say. Withdrawal of the objection to claims 22-25 is requested.

It is submitted that the claims are clear. It is also submitted that the claims continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If any further fees, other than and except for the issue fee, are necessary with respect to this paper, the U.S.P.T.O. is requested to obtain the same from deposit account number 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12/9/05

By: 
Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501